



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,255	03/17/2004	Pim van Meurs	TEGI0012C1P	5958
22862	7590	11/30/2007	EXAMINER	
GLENN PATENT GROUP			HAN, QI	
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L				
MENLO PARK, CA 94025				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/803,255	Applicant(s) MEURS ET AL.	
	Examiner Qi Han	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7-25,27,29,31,33,35-56,58,60,62-81 and 83-87 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7-25,27,29,31,33,35-56,58,60,62-81 and 83-87 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Amendment

2. This communication is responsive to the applicant's amendment filed on 09/12/2007. The applicant(s) amended claims 1, 4, 12, 20, 29, 36, 40,50 and 56-67, and added new claims 83-87 (see the amendment: pages 2-20).

The examiner withdrew the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7-25 and 27 under 35 USC 112, because the applicant amended the corresponding claims and they are overcomes the rejection.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/12/2007 with respect to the claim rejection under 35 USC 102/103, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, since the amended claims introduce new issue (or new matter) and/or change the scope of the claims. The response to the applicant's arguments based on the newly amended and added claims regarding prior art rejection (see Remarks, pages 24-28) is directed to the corresponding claim rejection (see detail below).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 29, 31, 33, 35-56, 58, 60, 62-81 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 29, the amended limitation (element 3 of the claim) “said **ideographic database** containing a set of **phonetic sequences** whose spellings correspond to said input sequence and a set of **stroke sequences** corresponding to the input sequence” introduces new subject matter because the limitation is not specifically described in the original specification (see the closest disclosure in the specification: page 8, line 27 to page 9, line 3 and Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 56, the rejection is based on the same described for claim 29, because the claim (see element (a), sub-element 3) includes the same or similar problematic limitation as claim 29.

Regarding claims 31, 33, 35-55, 58, 60, 62-81, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 29 and 56 (see above), because the dependent claims include the same or similar problematic limitation as their parent claims 29 and 56 respectively.

Regarding claim 86, the newly added limitation “said linguistic model causes said step of displaying to display a predicted word **prior** entry of **any** of said input sequence for said predicted word” introduces new subject matter, because the limitation is not specifically described in the original specification.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 29, 31, 33, 35-56, 58, 60, 62-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 29, the amended limitation (element 3 of the claim) “said **ideographic database** containing a set of **phonetic sequences** whose spellings correspond to said input sequence and a set of **stroke sequences** corresponding to the input sequence” is indefinite, because the limitation is inconsistent with the specification disclosure “an **ideographic database** containing a set of **ideographic character sequences**” (specification: page 8, lines 27-28).

Regarding claim 56, the rejection is based on the same described for claim 29, because the claim (see element (a), sub-element 3) includes the same or similar problematic limitation as claim 29.

Regarding claims 31, 33, 35-55, 58, 60, 62-81, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 29 and 56 (see above), because the dependent claims include the same or similar problematic limitation as their parent claims 29 and 56 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 3, 16, 18-20, 31, 44-45, 48-50, 58, 71 and 73-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WILLIAMS (2003/0144830 A1) in view of NI et al. (6,822,585 B1) hereinafter referenced as NI.

As per **claim 29**, as best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 1st and 2nd (see above), WILLIAMS discloses ‘language module and method for user with text processing devices’ (title), comprising:

“a reduced keyboard input device having a plurality of input means, each of said input means being associated with at least one of a plurality of strokes and a plurality of phonetic characters, an input sequence being generated each time an input means is selected by said user, wherein the generated input sequence has an interpretation that is ambiguous due to the plurality of strokes or phonetic characters associated with each input means” (paragraph (hereinafter references as p) 34, ‘pressing keys (a plurality of input means) of a mobile telephone’; 46, ‘keypad (reduced keyboard)’; p59, ‘subsequent strokes can be entered’; p62, ‘enter the subsequent letter of the intended Chinese character’s phonetic spelling’ and ‘language model 104 receives this data (Pinyin)...either unambiguously or categorically as a group of two or more Latin letters and retunes a number of candidate characters (implying interpretation is ambiguous)’);

“an input method specific database containing at least one of a set of stroke sequences corresponding to input sequences and a set of phonetic sequences corresponding to input sequences”, (p58-p63, ‘language module 104 implements three user input modes (method)’, ‘subsequent strokes can be entered to further limit the list of candidate characters...’, ‘receive data ... in a series of input’, ‘generates a list of addresses of characters’; p54-p55, ‘contents of word buffer 210 is used by input interpretation logic and database 214 to better select language unit candidates according to the context of recently entered language units (can be a series of strokes or Pinyin letters)’; ‘support two different context modes’: ‘uses dictionary’ and ‘uses a

list of proper nouns', wherein the database necessarily and/or inherently contains stroke sequences and/or phonetic sequences);

“an ideographic database associated with both stroke sequences and phonetic sequences, [said ideographic database containing a set of phonetic sequences whose spellings correspond to said input sequence and a set of stroke sequences corresponding to the input sequence,] each sequence representing a phrase comprising two or more ideographic characters” (p58, implements both GB-2312 and Big5 standard character sets (corresponding the ideographic database) of the Chinese written language'; p35, 'Font 216 store data (can also be interpreted as ideographic sequence database)'; wherein the database GB-2312 or Big5 is necessarily and/or inherently associated with (or indexed by) both stroke sequences and phonetics sequence, in order to either support stroke based input mode or phonetic based input mode; p31, 'stores data representing key strokes (sequence) entered by the user in specifying a message unit' that 'can be a character, a word, or a phrase' including 'multiple characters (two or more ideographic characters)'; also see p54);

“means for comparing an input sequence using said input method specific database and finding one or more stroke or phonetic sequences corresponding to the input sequence” (p59, 'the user enters the first written stroke by pressing a key corresponding to (comparing) the class to which the stroke belongs ... enters the next stroke... subsequent strokes can be entered for further limit the list of candidate character'; p62, 'use either selects a character or enters the subsequent letter of the intended Chinese character's phonetic spelling');

“means for converting said found stroke or phonetic sequences to one or more corresponding sequences representing phrases comprising two or more ideographic characters

using said database” (p54-p55, ‘contents of word buffer 210 is used by input interpretation logic and database 214 to better select language unit candidates according to the context of recently entered language units’, ‘uses single-character word but frequently also use multi-character words (corresponding to phrases)’, ‘uses a dictionary of ordinary words to select candidates of intended languages units’(converting); p61-p62, ‘delivers candidates which are closely linked to the previous character(s) to form words or names (phrases), ‘process can be repeated for subsequent Chinese characters (phrases)’); and

“an output device for displaying one or more found stroke or phonetic sequences, and one or more phrases corresponding to said found stroke or phonetic sequences” (p62, ‘these candidates are displayed to the user’; p85 ‘the display contains the stroke input history, the candidate characters and the candidate component symbols’).

WILLIAMS does not expressly disclose “simultaneously displays all of: a text region displaying text entered by the user, a phonetic Pinyin spelling selection list, and a Chinese phrase selection list, characters”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by NI who discloses ‘input of symbols’ (title), comprising ‘a Chinese input display’ (Fig. 5) including ‘different areas of the display and their contents during editing of a Chinese short message’ (Fig. 5 and col. 7, lines 10-22), wherein blocks 24, 25 and 16 are read on the claim. It is also noted that WILLIAMS discloses ‘the Chinese written language ... frequently also uses multi-character words (phrases)’ and ‘specifying a multi-character word to thereby more accurately select candidates’ (p54), which read on the claimed “each phrase of said a Chinese phrase comprises two or more ideographic characters”. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings and suggestions of

WILLIAMS and NI by providing a display with different areas for displaying edited text, pinyin strings, and candidates including multi-character word (phrase), for the purpose (motivation) of effectively and easily inputting characters into a terminal and/or improving character input method for the system (NI: col. 4, lines 6-9 and col. 11, lines 21-23).

As per **claim 31** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS does not expressly disclose “said stroke input system is 5-stroke or 8-stroke system”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by NI who discloses ‘input of symbols’ (title), comprising ‘any graphic glyph which can be inputted directly from a keyboard or a keypad’ and ‘the symbols include a alphabets, digits...character strokes and tone marks’ (col. 4, lines 21-26); ‘inputting characters into a terminal... having a plurality of keys’, ‘a number of the keys have associated with them a alphabet of different symbols (alternatively associated) which can be accessed and indicated in a display by means of single or multiple key selections or key presses of the keys’ (col. 4, lines 15-32), using ‘Chinese input dictionary which contains a mapping table of Pinyin string (phonetic characters) and matching Chinese characters (corresponding to ideographic database)’ (col. 6, lines 3-9), and that ‘the invention significantly simplifies the input of Pinyin (phonetic input) ... with carefully designed key mapping, this method can also improve other Chinese input methods ...such as Bopomofo or Wubizixin (five stroke input)’ (col. 11, lines 18-23), which suggests that Chinese dictionary (ideographic database) is necessarily associated with both Pinyin and stroke inputs and capable of allowing user select one of input methods. NI also teaches that ‘most of the existing Chinese input methods were original designed for PC keyboards’ and discloses the previous endeavor for a character input method that requires more basic input symbols than the number of keys on a keypad (col. 1, line 52 to col. 2, lines 40). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify WILLIAMS by providing input means with a plurality of keys that are associated with different symbols and using ideogram dictionary (database), such as Chinese input dictionary associated with input in both Pinyin method and Wubizixin (five stroke input) method, as taught by NI, for the purpose (motivation) of improving character input method (NI: col. 11, lines 21-23) for the system.

As per **claim 33** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS in view NI further discloses “said phonetic input system is a Pinyin system or a Zhuyin system” (WILLIAMS: p62-p63, ‘Pinyin’ and ‘BoPoMoFo’).

As per **claim 35** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS further discloses “prioritizing stroke or phonetic sequences that match an input sequence and prioritizing ideographic character sequences that match a matching stroke or phonetic sequence according to a linguistic model” (p59, ‘the user enters the first written stroke by pressing a key corresponding to the class to the stroke belongs and is shown the occurrence frequency of characters beginning with that stroke (interpreted as prioritizing) in everyday language usage’ (broadly interpreted as linguistic model); p58, ‘language model’).

As per **claim 36** (depending on claim 35), WILLIAMS in view NI further discloses “said linguistic model comprises use of application context of current sequence entry” (WILLIAMS: p59, ‘subsequence strokes’ that is ‘based on the occurrence frequency of characters ... in everyday language usage (interpreted as use of application context of current sequence entry)’).

As per **claim 37** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS in view NI discloses “said phonetic sequences comprise single syllables” (WILLIAMS: p62, wherein entering ‘Han Yu Pinyin’ letters for ‘word or name list’ necessarily and/or inherently includes single syllables).

As per **claim 38** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS in view NI discloses “said phonetic sequences comprise both single and multiple syllables” (WILLIAMS: p62, wherein entering ‘Han Yu Pinyin’ letters for ‘word or name list’ necessarily and/or inherently includes both single syllables and multiple syllables).

As per **claim 39** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS in view NI further discloses “said phonetic sequences comprise user generated sequences” (WILLIAMS: p62, ‘the user enters (generates) the first letter ...’ then ‘the user ... enters the subsequent letter (sequence) of the intended Chinese character’s phonetic spelling’).

As per **claim 40** (depending on claim 39), WILLIAMS in view NI further discloses “in absence of matching phonetic sequences in said input method specific database, a sequence of matching phonetic sequences is automatically generated based on single and optionally multiple syllable phonetic sequences” (WILLIAMS: p62, ‘when there are no more valid linkage (absence of matching) according to contextual relations between characters (such as multi-character words including the previous entered characters)... delivers (automatically generate) unlinked candidate characters’ and ‘the invocation of word association, whether by word or name list, is processed as previously described’).

As per **claim 41** (depending on claim 40), WILLIAMS in view NI further discloses “said sequence of matching phonetic sequences is narrowed down through user interaction”

(WILLIAMS: p59 and p62, 'subsequence strokes (or Pinyin letters) can be entered to further limit the list of characters (narrowed down through user interaction)').

As per **claim 42** (depending on claim 40), WILLIAMS in view NI further discloses "a sequence of matching ideographic character sequences is automatically generated based on matching phonetic sequences to ideographic character sequences" (WILLIAMS: p62, 'these candidates (matched ideographic character sequences) are displayed 'automatically generated)').

As per **claim 43** (depending on claim 42), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 41, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 41.

As per **claim 44** (depending on claim 35), WILLIAMS does not expressly disclose "changing the associated priority of the matching phonetic sequence and the sequence of ideographic characters once an ideographic character sequence is selected". However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by NI who further discloses 'during input of text, a user is presented with a list of the Latin symbols in an order determined (changed) by the probability (associated priority) of being the next symbol rather than being in default, for example alphabetical order', which suggests selection from the list may also changes the associated priority (order)' (NI: col. 3, lines 66 to col. 4, line 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify WILLIAMS by providing a list of the symbols to determine the probability (associated priority) of being the next symbol rather than being in default, for example alphabetical order, as taught by NI, for the purpose (motivation) of improving character input method and/or providing the most probable symbols (NI: col. 11, lines 21-23 and col. 3, lines 64) for the system.

As per **claim 45** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 31, because the rejection for claim 31 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 45, wherein a tone mark can be applied to Pinyin input.

As per **claim 48** (depending on claim 29), as stated above, WILLIAMS discloses that “the user is returned a sequence of phonetic sequences of exact matches” (WILLIAMS: p62-p63, ‘input mode known as “Han Yu Pinyin” and ‘BoPoMoFo’, either of them necessary includes exact matches; the candidate characters and the candidate component symbols’), but does not expressly disclose returning “predictions that partially match”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by NI who further discloses ‘predicts the next Chinese character according to the context and a Chinese word database’ and shows partially match (26; col. 3, lines 49 and Fig. 5, blacks 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify WILLIAMS by providing predicting the next Chinese character and returning partial partially match, as taught by NI, for the purpose (motivation) of improving character input method (NI: col. 11, lines 21-23) for the system.

As per **claim 49** (depending on claim 48), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 35, because the rejection for claim 35 covers the same or similar limitations as claim 49.

As per **claim 50** (depending on claim 49), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 36, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 36.

As per **claim 51** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 43, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 43.

As per **claim 52** (depending on claim 51), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 35, because the rejection for claim 35 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 52.

As per **claim 53** (depending on claim 52), WILLIAMS in view NI further discloses “said linguistic model comprises at least one of: ... ; frequency of occurrence of ideographic character sequences, stroke sequences or phonetic sequences in formal or conversational written text; frequency of occurrence of ideographic character sequences, stroke sequences or phonetic sequences when following a preceding character or characters; ...” (WILLIAMS: p59, ‘the occurrence frequency’; also see p58, ‘language model’).

As per **claims 1**, it recites a method. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 29, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 29.

As per **claim 3** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 31, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 31.

As per **claim 4** (depending to claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, because the rejection for claim 1 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 4.

As per **claims 5, 7-16, 18-23** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 33, 35-44, and 48-53 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 33, 35-44 and 48-53 respectively.

As per **claim 24** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 48, because the rejection for claim 48 covers the same or similar limitation(s) of this claim.

As per **claim 25** (depending on claim 24), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 48, because the rejection for claim 48 covers the same or similar limitation(s) of this claim.

As per **claim 56**, it recites a computer usable medium. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 29, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 1.

As per **claims 58, 60, 62-71 and 73-78** (depending on claim 56), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 31, 33, 35-44 and 48-53 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 31, 33, 35-44 and 48-53 respectively.

As per **claim 79** (depending on claim 56), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 48, because the rejection for claim 48 covers the same or similar limitation(s) of this claim.

As per **claim 80** (depending on claim 79), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 48, because the rejection for claim 48 covers the same or similar limitation(s) of this claim.

As per **claim 83** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 29, because the rejection for claim 29 (element 2) covers the same or similar limitation(s) of this claim.

As per **claim 84** (depending on claim 1), as stated in claim 29, WILLIAMS in view NI discloses “wherein said input sequence corresponds to a partial Pinyin spelling, wherein prior to said input sequence completing a first Chinese character, said step of displaying displays a corresponding Chinese phrase having two or more Chinese characters” (see above regarding claim 29, last element, using combined teachings of WILLIAMS, p52 and p62 and NI, Fig.2).

As per **claim 86** (depending on claim 1), as best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 1st and 2nd (see above), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 48, because the rejection for claim 48 covers the same or similar limitation(s) of this claim.

7. Claims 27, 46, 54-55 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WILLIAMS in view NI applied to claims 1, 29 and 56, and further in view of ZHANG et al. (5,197,810) hereinafter referenced as ZHANG.

As per **claim 46** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS in view NI does not expressly disclose “one of said plurality of inputs is associated with a **special wildcard** input that is associated with any or all tones”. However, the feature of using a wildcard for inputting and displaying symbols/texts is well known in the art as evidenced by ZHANG who discloses method and system for inputting simplified forma and/or original complex form of Chinese character (title), comprising ‘Fuzzy auxiliary inputting method’ in which some special keys ‘can be used in substitution as a wild card’ or ‘can be used as the fuzzy key (wildcard key)’(col. 13, line 59 to col. 13, line 8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify WILLIAMS in view NI by providing an input

method with wild card used for substitution of input symbols or text, taught by ZHANG, for the purpose (motivation) of using the wild card in substitution of an input (ZHANG: col. 13, lines 62-63), such as input of Pinyin characters and/or strokes representing Chinese character components.

As per **claim 54** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 46, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 46.

As per **claim 55** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 46, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 46.

As per **claim 27** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 55, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 55.

As per **claim 81** (depending on claim 56), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 55, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 55.

8. Claims 17, 47 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WILLIAMS in view NI applied to claims 1, 29 and 56, and further in view of KRAFT et al. (US 2003/0017858 A1) hereinafter referenced as KRAFT.

As per **claim 47** (depending on claim 29), WILLIAMS in view NI does not expressly disclose “the user can specify an explicit ideographic character separator”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by KRAFT who discloses ‘data entry by string of possible candidate information’ (title), comprising ‘hard separator’ and ‘soft separator’ for separating input text (sentences or words) (p72). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify WILLIAMS in view NI by

providing an separator for inputting text, for the purpose (motivation) of improving method of entering data into a communication terminal (KRAFT: p6).

As per **claim 17** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 47, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 47.

As per **claim 72** (depending on claim 56), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 47, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 47.

9. Claim 85 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WILLIAMS in view NI applied to claims 1, 29 and 56, and further in view of CHEN (US 6,073,146) hereinafter referenced as CHEN.

As per **claim 85** (depending on claim 1), WILLIAMS in view NI does not expressly disclose “spellings associated with regional accents.” However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by CHEN who discloses ‘system and method for processing Chinese language text’ (title), comprising that ‘the accent structure of notional words depends on the dialect’, accent structure examples of ‘Shanghai dialect’ and ‘Beijing dialect’ using ‘pinyin’ syllable strings (spelling associated with regional accents), and developing/applying/implementing the rules with appropriate processes for the phonetic phenomenon in Chinese language (col. 15, line 60, to col. 16, line 62), which suggests that CHEN’s system provides the related accent/dialect information and implements the functionality as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify WILLIAMS in view NI by providing phonetic information and rules for handling different accents/dialects in

Chinese language, as taught by CHEN, for the purpose (motivation) of improving accuracy of the processing phonetic Chinese for the system (CHEN: col. 16, lines 60-62).

10. Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WILLIAMS in view NI applied to claims 1, 29 and 56, and further in view of KIM (US 2007/0106492 A1) hereinafter referenced as KIM.

As per **claim 87** (depending on claim 1), even though WILLIAMS in view NI discloses “a linguistic model (language model)” that “selects full spelling of a word from said input method specific database based upon said input sequence” (WILLIAMS: p62), WILLIAMS in view NI does not expressly disclose the input sequence “representing **only the first character** (letter) of each syllable of said word, wherein said each syllable contains multiple characters” However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by KIM who discloses ‘apparatus and method for inputting alphabet characters’ (title), comprising “language restricted concurrent input method” for Chinese, providing ‘syllable-based initial code of Chinese’, so that when entering “bj” (first character of each syllable of a word), ‘the system can provide a word of “Beijing” (in Pinyin) corresponding to the simple code “14” for user” (p480-p484), which read on the claim. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify WILLIAMS in view NI by providing the language restricted concurrent input method for Chinese using the simple code for inputting first letter of each syllable of a word, for the purpose (motivation) of entering commonly used words with small number of strokes and/or enhance the convenience in entering characters (KIM: p14).

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop _____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: 571-273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: 571-273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, and please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c) and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop _____
Randolph Building
Alexandria, VA 22314

Application/Control Number:
10/803,255
Art Unit: 2626

Page 20

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qi Han whose telephone numbers is (571) 272-7604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (571) 272-7602.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov. For general information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

QH/qh
November 27, 2007


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER